



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1480
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/675,431

09/30/2003

Terry Hamer

29516/38347

6194

4743 7590 05/24/2007
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300
SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

DAYE, CHELCIE L

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2161

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/24/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,431	HAMER, TERRY	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Chelcie Daye	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 37-54, 56-59, 67, 69-70, and 74-80 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-36, 60-66 and 81-84 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17, 37-54, 56-59, 67, 69, 70 and 74-80 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is issued in response to applicant's amendment filed on April 13, 2007.
2. Claims 1-84 are presented. No claims are added and claims 55,68, and 71-73 are cancelled.
3. Claims 18-36,60-66, and 81-84 remain withdrawn.
4. Claims 1-17,37-54,56-59,67,69-70, and 74-80 are pending.
5. Applicant's arguments filed April 13, 2007, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. **Claims 1-17,37-59,and 67-80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over de l'Etraz (US Patent No. 6,324,541) filed June 5, 2000, in view of Cheah (US Patent No. 7,003,546) filed October 13, 1999.**

Regarding Claims 1,37,54,67-68, and 71, de l'Etraz discloses a relationship management system, comprising:

a first database that stores a plurality of user collections, each user collection including one or more first contact files, each first contact file including contact data that is unique to a particular one of the first contact files (Fig. 1; columns 19-20, lines 38-67 and 1-38, respectively, de l'Etraz);

a second database that stores a firm collection, the firm collection including a plurality of second contact files, each second contact file having at least a portion of data in common with one of the first contact files (Fig. 1; columns 20-21, lines 40-67 and 1-55, respectively, de l'Etraz). However, de l'Etraz is silent with respect to an administration routine stored in a memory and adapted to be executed on a processor to detect a change made to the common data of one of the first contact files within one or more of the plurality of user collections, to send a message including the change to a data administrator interface, and in response to the message, to at least one of approve, reject, or follow up on the change from the data administrator interface; wherein approving the change prompts the administration routine to make the change to the common data of the corresponding second contact file within the firm collection and to make the change to the common data of the remaining user collections. On the other hand, Cheah discloses an administration routine stored in a memory and adapted to be executed on a processor (column 29, lines 38-59, Cheah) to detect a change made to the common data of one of the first contact files within one or more of the plurality of user collections (column 26, lines 42-44, and column 29, lines 25-37, Cheah), to send a message including the change

to a data administrator interface, and in response to the message, to at least one of approve, reject, or follow up on the change from the data administrator interface (column 18, lines 27-38 and columns 18-19, lines 53-67 and 1-12, respectively, Cheah); wherein approving the change prompts the administration routine to make the change to the common data of the corresponding second contact file within the firm collection and to make the change to the common data of the remaining user collections (column 19, lines 39-46 and column 20, lines 11-18 and column 30, lines 43-64, Cheah). De l'Etraz and Cheah are analogous art because they are from the same field of endeavor of storing, processing, and displaying contact information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Cheah's teachings into the de l'Etraz system. A skilled artisan would have been motivated to combine as suggested by Cheah at column 2, lines 47-61, in order to control the use of corporate and user information, by updating previous information, facilitating registration, and disabling certain users from further use. As a result, improving approaches to automatically distribute and update contact information.

Regarding Claims 2 and 38, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system further including a user collection change routine adapted to make a change to the common data of a contact file associated with the particular contact within a second one of the user collections based on the change made to the common data of the corresponding

second contact file associated with the particular contact within the firm collection (column 9, lines 45-64, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 3,39,70,and 72, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration routine is further adapted to provide a message to a firm administrator (column 29, lines 38-59, Cheah) reflecting the nature of the detected change made to one of the contact files associated with a particular contact within one or more of the plurality of user collections (columns 25-26, lines 52-67 and 1-3, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 4,40,55,and 73, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration routine is further adapted to enable the firm administrator to accept or reject the detected change before the administration routine makes the change to the common data of the corresponding second contact file associated with the particular contact within the firm collection (column 22, lines 8-50, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 5,41,and 56, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration routine includes a rule database that stores rules pertaining to the manner in

Art Unit: 2161

which the detected change is to be processed (columns 19-20, lines 62-67 and 1-10, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 6,42,and 57, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the rules are changeable by the administrator (column 23, lines 30-39, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 7,43,and 58, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration routine is further adapted to process the detected change to detect a suspected error within the detected change (column 24, lines 24-35, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 8,44,and 59, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration routine is further adapted to provide a message to a firm administrator reflecting a description of the suspected error within the detected change (columns 14-15, lines 66-67 and 1-8, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 9,45,and 74, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein each of the user collections includes a change attribute that specifies a manner in which a change

Art Unit: 2161

made to the firm collection is to be reflected within the user collection (column 30, lines 43-64, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 10,46,and 75, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the change attribute, when set to a first value, specifies that a change to the firm collection is to be automatically made to the user collection (column 23, lines 40-47, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 11,47,and 76, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the change attribute, when set to a first value, specifies that a change to the firm collection is to be reported to a user having access to the user collection for which the change attribute exists (column 30, lines 55-60, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 12,48,and 77, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the change attribute, when set to a first value, specifies that a change to the firm collection is to be accepted by the user having access to the user collection for which the change attribute exists before being made to the user collection for which the change attribute exists (column 25, lines 52-67, Cheah).

Art Unit: 2161

Regarding Claims 13,49,and 78, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein each of the user collections includes a visibility field that specifies if a change made to a contact file within the user collection is to be shared with the firm collection (columns 20-21, lines 55-67 and 1-9, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 14,50,and 79, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein each of the contact files includes a plurality of contact information fields and wherein the visibility flag specifies a visibility of one of the contact information fields (Fig.18J; columns 20-21, lines 55-67 and 1-9, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 15,51,and 80, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein each of the contact files includes a plurality of contact information fields and wherein the visibility flag specifies a visibility of an entire contact file (Fig.18J; columns 20-21, lines 55-67 and 1-9, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 16 and 52, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration routine is further adapted to process the detected change to detect the addition of the first contact file for a contact within one of the user collections for which the

Art Unit: 2161

second contact file already exists within the firm collection (columns 27-28, lines 53-67 and 1-6, respectively, Cheah).

Regarding Claims 17 and 53, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, disclose the relationship management system wherein the administration routine is further adapted to process the detected change to detect a user request for an administrator to make a change to the firm collection (column 26, lines 37-44, Cheah).

Regarding Claim 69, the combination of de l'Etraz in view of Cheah, the relationship management system wherein each user collection is accessible by a different user (column 18, lines 28-39, Cheah) and further comprising a display routine stored on a computer-readable medium, wherein the display routine is adapted to display the data pertaining to different contacts stored within each user collection to the user having access to the user collection (Fig.18C; columns 16-17, lines 62-67 and 1-42, respectively, Cheah).

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues, "The system disclosed by Cheah is quite different from the claimed system that, upon notice to and approval from "an administrator interface" saves the updated contact data to a central "firm collection" as recited by the amended claims...In further contrast to the disclosure of Cheah, the amended claims recite

sending notice of the update to an "administrator interface" as opposed to sending notice to one or more parties to a previous contact data exchange" and also argues, "Because Cheah does not disclose "sending a message including the change to a data administrator interface..., at least one of approving, rejecting, or following up on the change at the...interface..., or making the change to the common data of the corresponding second contact file within the firm collection...", Cheah does not disclose the administration routine".

Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., 'an administrator interface saves the updated contact data to a central firm collection') are not recited in the rejected claim(s).

Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Next, in response to applicant's arguments with respect to the newly amended features as argued above not being disclosed by Cheah, examiner points to specific citations throughout the reference to disclose such features. To further elaborate Cheah discloses at column 18, lines 27-38 and columns 18-19, lines 53-67 and 1-12; respectively, wherein *"the requested exchanges of profile information are made between one client-side application and another client-side application located on different local machines. These different client-side applications are utilized by different users and communicate with one another through the server system. When the requested party receives an exchange request, the requested party is able to accept or*

Art Unit: 2161

deny the exchange request" and "after identifying the requested party, an exchange request is submitted to the server system. The server system can then process the exchange request and inform the requestor exchange processing whether a response has been received to the exchange request. A decision block determines whether a server response has been received to the exchange request...Once the decision block determines that a server response has been received, the status of the exchange request is displayed. As an example, the status of the exchange request can be either: accepted, waiting or denied...Hence, the requestor is able to observe the status of the one or more uncompleted exchange requests that it has made". Examiner interprets the exchange requests, the displaying of the status on the client device, and the accepting or denying, to correspond to the message being sent to a data administrator interface and a response to the message being either an approval, rejection, or waiting. Further, Cheah discloses at column 19, lines 39-46 and column 20, lines 11-18 and column 30, lines 43-64, more examples of making/applying the change to the firm collection and other user collections. Lastly, the administrator routine has been disclosed in its entirety by Cheah at column 29, lines 25-59, because throughout the reference, multiple instances have referenced that the administrator performs all of the functions as the client-side application such as creation, design, and update features. Therefore, the above-argued limitation has been fully disclosed.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action.

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Points of Contact

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chelcie Daye whose telephone number is 571-272-3891. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 7:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Apu Mofiz can be reached on 571-272-4080. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chelcie Daye
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2100
May 22, 2007


APU MOFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER